1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	*, CASE NO. CV			
12	Plaintiff, ORDER RE MARKMAN HEARING			
13	v. {			
14	$\left\{ \right.$			
15	Defendant.			
16	}			
17				
18	The Court will schedule or has scheduled a Markman Hearing. <b>THE</b>			
19	COURT WILL NOT CONSTRUE MORE THAN SIX TERMS, UNLESS A			
20	PARTY DEMONSTRATES A COMPELLING CAUSE TO DO SO.			
21	By not later than three weeks before the <i>Markman</i> hearing, the parties shall			
22	file the following:			
23	1. A Joint Statement of Disputed and Undisputed Terms for each patent at			
24	issue. This statement shall list in chart form each disputed and undisputed			
25	term (and each column and line where the term appears), Plaintiff's			
26	interpretation and Defendant's interpretation. (Only undisputed terms that			
27	are important for the Court's construction of the disputed terms need be			
28	included.) The Statement shall be brief and shall not contain argument;			

ı

1		however, Plaintiff and Defendant shall reference, by page number, the			
2		section of their brief supporting their interpretation. Attached to this Order			
3		is a sample joint statement.			
4	2.	An Electronic Copy of the Joint Statement of Disputed and Undisputed			
5		<u>Terms</u>			
6	3.	A List of Exhibits and of All Witnesses (identified by status or function)			
7		upon whose testimony the parties will rely at the hearing.			
8	4.	<u>Declarations</u> containing the direct testimony of each party's witnesses.			
9	5.	A Brief not to exceed 25 pages. The brief shall include a description of			
10		both the patented product or process and the allegedly infringing product or			
11		process. <sup>1</sup>			
12		By not later than one week before the Markman hearing, each party may			
13	file a	le a Reply. Reply briefs shall not exceed 10 pages.			
14					
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
16					
17	DATE	A. Howard Matz			
18		United States District Judge			
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24	1	"While a trial court should certainly not prejudge the ultimate			
25	infring	gement analysis by construing claims with an aim to include or exclude an			

<sup>&</sup>quot;While a trial court should certainly not prejudge the ultimate infringement analysis by construing claims with an aim to include or exclude an accused product or process, knowledge of that product or process provides meaningful context for the first step of the infringement analysis, claim construction." Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co., 442 F.3d 1322, 1326-27 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

## IDENTIFICATION OF PATENT CLAIM PHRASES FOR U.S. PATENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_

CLAIM TEXT AND COLUMN/LINE REFERENCE		PLAINTIFF'S INTERPRETATION AND AUTHORITY	DEFENDANT'S INTERPRETATION AND AUTHORITY	
1.	"In a <b>switched power supply</b> " (Col. 6, Lns 41-42; Col. 9, Lns 36-54)	AGREED TERM switched power supply: A circuit that delivers power to a load by using an electronic switch (e.g., power switch).		
2.	"a rectifier adapted to be connected to the alternating current line" (Col. 10, Lns 13-15)	AGREED TERM rectifier: A circuit or device that converts an alternating polarity signal to a single polarity signal ( <i>i.e.</i> , typically a full-wave diode bridge).		
		DISPUTED TERM alternating current line: Electrical conductors capable of carrying a current whose direction changes at recurring intervals of time.  Authority: Plaintiff's Brief at 9-10.	DISPUTED TERM  alternating current line: Two or more physical conductors that carry a voltage waveform that varies in amplitude and polarity in a sinusoidal fashion (e.g., the wires leading up to a typical wall outlet).  Authority: Defendant's Brief at 14-19.	